

261
M76c

THE LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF ILLINOIS

CIVILIZATION

AND

THE SEE OF ROME.

A LECTURE

DELIVERED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF

The Catholic Union of Ireland,

BY THE RIGHT HON.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P.

ONE SHILLING.

UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS LIBRARY

DUBLIN:

M'GLASHAN & GILL, 50 UPPER SACKVILLE STREET.

W. B. KELLY, 8 GRAFTON STREET.

1874.

CIVILIZATION
AND
THE SEE OF ROME.
A LECTURE

DELIVERED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF

The Catholic Union of Ireland,

BY THE RIGHT HON.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P.

ONE SHILLING.

DUBLIN:
M'GLASHAN & GILL, 50 UPPER SACKVILLE STREET.
W. B. KELLY, 8 GRAFTON STREET.

1874.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

CIVILIZATION AND THE SEE OF ROME.

ON THE 13TH OF OCTOBER, 1874, THE RIGHT HON. LORD ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P., DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING LECTURE (THE FIRST DELIVERED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE CATHOLIC UNION OF IRELAND, AND NOW PUBLISHED BY IT) IN THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, DUBLIN. THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF GRANARD, K.P., PRESIDENT OF THE CATHOLIC UNION, PRESIDED ON THE OCCASION.

HAVE you ever attempted to picture, in imagination, the state of society when Christianity began the work of redeeming it? If you have, you must have seen how, to human minds, the task would have appeared hopelessly beyond the power of remedy. If you have, you will be able to estimate the enormous difficulties which had to be encountered, and appreciate the means by which we know that those difficulties were surmounted, and the work, at last, achieved. But if we shrink from this labour of historical imagination, we shall sink, in hopeless despair, at the sight of evils in these days, which are less, indeed, in amount, but similar in character; and we shall foolishly despise those means which still exist, because they were instituted by our Lord as the only means of rescuing society from the power of the devil. We may perchance call them "rusty weapons," and may accuse the Church of "furbishing them up anew."

That is the subject to which, by a slight and hasty sketch, I hope to draw the minds of the Catholic Union of Ireland to-night—that Union whose end is "to guard our faith from assaults, and to assert the rights of the Church, which are invaded, and to uphold the injured honour of religion and of God."

We must first turn our eyes for a few moments to the society of the Roman Empire, which was utterly effete, cruel, sunk in luxury, and given up to immorality in its grossest and most revolting forms. We must, in the next place, regard the more manly, but fierce and violent barbarians, who came and mingled themselves with that Roman society, adding to all the evils of animal sensuality the savageness and ferocity of wild beasts.

The evils, which I shall touch lightly upon, may be divided into four classes.

- (1.) Oppression of the poor.
- (2.) Swinish debauchery of the rich.
- (3.) Disregard of law and justice.
- (4.) The continual conflicts between states.

On these revolting parts of the picture I shall not detain you long ; for it will be far more agreeable and instructive to dwell upon the remedy which was successful in removing them. In conclusion, I will ask you to consider for yourselves whether similar evils are not again beginning to invade society, simply because the world now persists in ignoring and despising—nay, rather, hating—the remedy which our Lord devised.

I take the first class. (1.) In the Roman Empire, the poor—the labouring men—were all slaves. Neither in town nor in the country was any work done except by slaves. How much does that one word tell us of the condition of the working classes at the beginning of the Christian era ! A slave was not a person but a chattel—a thing, or possession, destined merely to subserve the will of his or her master. The only end of the slave's life was to minister to that master's pleasures.

That was the condition of the great majority of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire. Athenæus asserts that many Roman families possessed as many as 10,000 or even 20,000 slaves a-piece. The slave population, according to Tacitus, greatly exceeded the free population.

What was the treatment of this vast majority of the population ? In what did some of the pleasures of the masters consist ? Pollio narrates that the lampreys in the fish-ponds of the Roman patri-cians were fattened with the flesh of slaves. Sometimes the slaves were subjected to a wholesale slaughter, partly to feast the blood-thirsty eyes of their proprietors, and partly to allay their suspicious fears, or to glut their desire for some petty revenge. Sometimes hundreds of slaves were put to the torture, in order to extort from them the knowledge of one offender. It is related in history that a man of consular rank was murdered, and that all his slaves, some thousands, were at once led out to execution.

As late as 250 years after the birth of our Lord, the Roman Empire extended from the Western Ocean to the Tigris, and from Mount Atlas to the Rhine and the Danube. But, says Gibbon, all that 250 years "had been consumed in apparent prosperity and internal decline." Throughout that vast tract of country "the industry of the people was discouraged and exhausted by a long series of oppression" [vol. i., p. 243]. With regard to one part of that Empire, viz., Gaul, he adds that [vol. ii., p. 118] "during the long series of troubles which agitated Gaul, from the reign of Gallienus

to that of Diocletian, the condition of the servile peasants was peculiarly miserable ; and they experienced at once the complicated tyranny of their masters, of the barbarians, of the soldiers, and of the officers of the revenue." Let that suffice to give us an insight into the condition of the poor in the Roman Empire. Let us now pass to the second head—the swinish debauchery of Roman society.

(2.) To learn the depths to which this cancer had eaten into the vitals of Roman society, we may fitly read the first chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Or let us hear, from Gibbon's History [vol. i., p. 158], the character of an emperor which the Romans regarded as not inglorious :—"Every sentiment of virtue and humanity was extinct in the mind of Commodus. . . . He valued nothing in sovereign power, except the unbounded license of indulging his sensual appetites. His hours were spent in a seraglio of beautiful women, and as many boys, of every rank and of every province ; and wherever the arts of seduction proved ineffectual, the brutal lover had recourse to violence." This low animal life pervaded every rank of society. The butcheries of the circus were always accompanied by the lowest debauchery in its precincts ; and the coarsest animal appetites were fostered and encouraged by the scenes of lust and blood on which the people feasted their eyes.

(3.) But let us turn from the precincts of the circus to the amphitheatre itself, while we consider the third head into which we have divided the character of the Roman Empire : namely, the disregard of law and justice. How could there be a sense of law in a people whose amusement was butchery—a people who were born in the midst of butchery, and brought up to relish slaughter and butchery? Tertullian [De Spectaculis, c. 19] regarded these amusements of the Roman people as the very acme of "cruelty, impiety, and beastiality." He said that they originated in devil-worship, and were maintained in the interests of devils. Pliny recounts a fight in one of these arenas between 20 wild elephants and 600 poor captives. He mentions also some "games"—(games, indeed!)—which were given by Trajan, that excellent emperor!—games of 120 days, in which 10,000 men and more than 10,000 beasts had to do battle unto death.

In those fights it was the *sacred* virgins who, by reversing the thumb, devoted the poor wounded and vanquished combatant to his doom. Some sawdust was then sprinkled over his blood, a hook was thrust into his ribs, and he was dragged from the arena and thrown into a gory pit, while another gladiator was quickly turned in to take his place, Such was the pleasure of the Roman people! Men were "butchered to make a Roman holiday."

The disregard for law and justice did not stop there. Gibbon informs us [vol. ii., p. 212] that the whole empire was full of

sycophants and delators, whose only business was to bring false accusations of crime against the rich, and to substantiate their false assertions by false oaths. The aim of these men was the confiscation of the property of the wealthy, which then became their booty. The emperor himself was at the head of this universal gang of bandits. "He filled Rome and Italy (says Gibbon), as well as Africa, with armed troops, connived at their tumults, suffered them with impunity to plunder and even to massacre the defenceless people; and, indulging them in the same licentiousness which their emperor enjoyed, Maxentius often bestowed on his military favourites the splendid villa, or the beautiful wife of a senator." Moreover, the country was overrun by hordes of tax-gatherers and other officials. We are told by Latin writers that the number who extorted taxes was greater than the number of those who paid them. They exacted innumerable imposts, when imposts were not due. They forced their way into houses, to take inventories of things, or to find some article which they might pretend to be liable to taxation. They even put men and women to the torture, so that they, in order to escape, might, in their pain, confess to the possession of some article on which imposts could be laid, although they did not possess it. Such a system ruined the whole empire, but it desolated Gaul. [Lactantius. *De mortibus persecutorum*. 7 & 23, and Ozanam. *Études Germ. i.*, p. 424.]

I cannot conclude this picture of Roman society better than by a quotation from Count de Champagny [*Les Césars*, vol. ii., p. 209]:—"The despotic government came to the rescue, as the only *possible* government, for keeping in check, on the one hand, the masses of prolétaires and slaves who were irritated by suffering; and for coercing, on the other, beneath a rule both sanguinary and ignominious, an aristocracy which was ambitious and quarrelsome, aspiring after power, and ever ready to raise the standard of civil war."

Such then was the society of the Romans—effeminate, sunk in luxury, steeped in the grossest immorality, regardless of law and justice; and yet, in spite of their effeminacy, ready to commit murders, or even to revolt whenever they could do so with impunity. Let us now pass to that society of the barbarians, which was superadded to the Roman society before the time that the Christian Church began, on a great scale, her work of reformation. These barbarians we shall find to be less luxurious, and more manly, but, withal, fierce and violent. With the exception of excessive drink, we may therefore consider that, in their case, the first three species of evils are undeserving of lengthened notice; while the vices of the fourth head (of which the Romans were deficient, in consequence of their effeminacy) will now stand out in bold relief. "With the exception of excessive drink," I said; because we

learn from Tacitus that the Romans encouraged the passion for drink among the Germans. They did this in order to reduce by debauchery, those whom they had failed to conquer by force of arms. For the same reason (according to Tacitus) they also sowed hatreds, and stirred up dissensions, and fanned the flames of war among the barbarian tribes. "To kill and to rob," said he, "that was the age; the Romans made a solitude, and called it peace." [Agricola 30.]

(4.) In their own conduct towards the barbarians, the Romans did even more to increase the natural ferocity of manners. For, by the indiscriminate slaughter of men and destruction of buildings, they added, in the breasts of the barbarians, the thirst for vengeance to their savageness of disposition, and aroused the natural implacability of temper of those who were about to form the dominant part of Roman society. Pollio quotes a letter of Maximinus to the Senate, in which he says:—"For 400 miles we have burned all the German villages, we have carried off all their cattle, and we have taken as captives those who were unarmed, while we killed all who were found with arms." The unarmed were, of course, reserved for the butcheries of the circus, or the debaucheries of the seraglio.

The disposition of the Germans, thus excited by the Romans, has been pictured by S. Salvian [De Gub: Dei, lib. vi.], in describing Treves: "The first city of the Gauls was thrice destroyed. The whole town had become one sepulchre. Through woes increasing with each destruction, those who had evaded the enemy, in the demolition of the city, could not escape the calamities which succeeded the demolition . . . Some died from hunger; from nakedness, some; others by fever; others by exposure to cold; and so by divers ways all reached that one sepulchre of death together . . . I myself have seen (aye, and I lived after witnessing such a spectacle!)—I have seen, lying about in every place, the corpses of men and women, wounded, naked, unchastely offending the eye, and mangled by birds and dogs. The funereal smell of the dead was a deadly pestilence for the living; death was exhaled from death."

The Goths invaded Italy, A.D. 250: "A fierce multitude," says Gibbon [vol. i., p. 398.]—a multitude, because it was not at one; it was not organized; it was at war with itself; it "was agitated by various and often hostile intentions." Germany itself was divided into forty independent states, which were always at war. Each state was subdivided into tribes, whose "union" says Gibbon, "was extremely loose and precarious. The barbarians were easily provoked; they knew not how to forgive an injury, much less an insult. Their resentments were bloody and implacable. The casual disputes that so frequently happened in their tumultuous parties of hunting or drinking, were sufficient to inflame the minds

of whole nations; the private feud of any considerable chieftains diffused itself among their followers and allies. To chastise the insolent, or to plunder the defenceless, were alike causes of war."

The Franks [Gibbon, i., 435] overran Gaul and Spain in A.D. 256. They are described as of "an inconstant spirit, who disregarded the most solemn treaties." "Wretched cottages, scattered amidst the *ruins* of magnificent cities, still recorded, even as late as the fifth century, the rage of these barbarians." But the Huns were the fiercest, the most debased, the most brutal of all the barbarians.

The concluding sentence of Gibbon's first volume testifies admirably to the savageness of this element in the society which the Christian Church was to civilize. For he expresses his belief "that war, pestilence, and famine had consumed, in a few years, the moiety of the human species."

These two elements—the debauched and profligate Roman and the savage and bloody barbarian—were the warring components of that society which Christianity was to redeem. A society—

"where eldest night
And chaos held
Eternal anarchy, amidst the noise
Of endless wars, and by confusion stand."
[MILTON.—*Paradise Lost*.]

That was the condition of society. What remedy *could* be successful in reforming it?

In the first ages of Christianity, from the death of our Lord to the time of Nero, and from Nero until Constantine, in the "sowing" and the "watering" times of the Church, Christians were of absolutely no account. Their Master was a poor labourer, a carpenter's boy, who had been condemned and executed with the death of the vilest malefactor. The first teachers of the Church were a few ignorant fishermen, of a nation despised by the Romans. It is true that men had observed how the members of this obscure sect "loved one another;" and how they had "all things in common" (which was the abolition of pauperism from among them); and how (as Gibbon relates) [vol. ii., 315] the Christian "demonstrated his faith by his virtues." But what was this little sect in an overwhelming world of moral turpitude, splendid luxury, high-handed lawlessness, and fierce and crushing barbarism! Christians were despised; they were the butts for the scoffs and jeers of the world; they were, as Tacitus tells us, "held in hatred and abhorrence by the human race." All they were good for was to be "butchered in the circus to make a Roman holiday."

Yet, look at that little society—despised as their Master was!

It is working, silently, like leaven, in these three first centuries of planting and watering. It snatches up one man here, and another there, to live in darkened catacombs, or to die in glorious martyrdom. The heads of this little society—the succession of Popes—were martyrs, crushed under the Pagan oppressor's heel. How *can* this little society, or these powerless Popes, ever do anything to remedy the evils under which a hellish society was labouring!

The stone was being cut out in the barren mountains. The death of each Pope or martyr was a chip with God's mallet and chisel; painful, but forming. At last the stone was cut out and formed, and set a-rolling down the mountain slope to crush the feet of iron and clay—the ten kingdoms of Latin and of Teutonic race.

Another age of Christianity has commenced. Let us take a glance, as far as it affects our subject, at the constitution of this society of Christians, as the curtain is drawn aside in the reign of Constantine, to exhibit the drama of the world's history.

We see this Christian society with a Pope at its head, who was invested with a primacy of honour and jurisdiction, conferred on St. Peter the first Pope, and on every one of his successors, by our Lord himself. This primacy of the head of the Church involved his jurisdiction both in government and in doctrine. This jurisdiction or legitimate authority was a *tota plenitudo supremæ potestatis* to pasture and rule the Universal Church—an "entire plenitude of supreme authority," viz.: judicial, legislative, and coercive.

As the curtain of obscurity is drawn aside, when Constantine ascended the throne, we see, then, in the Pope, a supreme judge over the whole Christian commonwealth, from whose sentence there was no appeal; a supreme lawgiver; and the source of executive power. To this plenitude of supreme authority there was added, of course, a proportionate grace, by which it was sustained; and, to his divine mission and office of Teacher, there was attached a security against error, whenever he spoke officially as Chief Pastor of the Church on questions of faith and morals. That is, the assistance of infallibility attached to the jurisdiction of the Head of the Church, in all questions of faith and morals, whether in the form of doctrine or of discipline, and in so far as it extended to faith and morals; while a large part of his jurisdiction or supreme authority lay beyond his infallibility. Of this latter gift I do not require to say more; but I will speak further of the jurisdiction of the Popes.

Cardinal Antonelli thus explained it to the Nuncio at Paris, in a despatch written on March 19th, 1870. "The arguments advanced in this projected constitution (of the Vatican Council) and in the subjoined canons *do no more than expound the maxims and fundamental principles of the Church*; principles which have been many times reiterated in the acts of preceding General

Councils, and enunciated and developed in similar Pontifical constitutions, which have been published in all Catholic States of the world ; . . . principles, in fine, which have always formed the basis of the teaching of the Church in all ages. . . . The Church having received from God the high mission of directing men, whether individually or as constituted together in a society, towards a supernatural end, received thereby not only the authority but also the duty to judge of the morality and justice of all their acts, whether domestic or foreign, in respect of their conformity to law, natural and divine. And as no action, whether commanded by a sovereign authority as means to some political end, or voluntarily committed by an individual, can escape the character of morality and justice, so it comes to be that the judgment of the Church, although directly touching the morality of those acts, yet indirectly extends to the acts themselves which are affected with that moral character."

The following is the authoritative declaration [Dogmatic Const. of the Church, cap. iii.] :—"If, then, anyone shall say that the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Universal Church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world ; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fulness of this supreme power ; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the Churches, and over each and all the Pastors and faithful—let him be anathema." The next chapter begins by the assertion that the power of teaching is comprehended in the Apostolic Primacy.

Again—the present Pontiff used these words in replying to the Address from the Academia of the Catholic Religion (July 21st, 1871):—"There are many errors regarding the infallibility ; but the most malicious of all is that which includes, in that dogma, the right of deposing sovereigns and declaring the people no longer bound by the obligation of fidelity. This right has now and again, in critical circumstances, been exercised by the Pontiffs ; but it has nothing to do with Papal infallibility. Its origin was not the infallibility, but the authority of the Pope. This authority—in accordance with public right, which was then vigorous, and with the acquiescence of all Christian nations, who revered, in the Pope, the supreme judge of the Christian Commonwealth—extended so far as to pass judgment, even in civil affairs, on the acts of princes and of nations."

Pope Innocent III., speaking of "this constitution as not human, but divine," wrote that—"There is no one of sane mind who doubts that it is part of our office to snatch *every* Christian of

every rank from every kind of mortal sin." Again: "It is not only in our power, but our duty, to judge and censure *everyone* for sin."

Every Pontiff inflicted punishments in exercise of his right as Supreme Ruler over the Christian Commonwealth, in which all Christian nations were united in a divine federation. A punishment is an act of the coercitive or executive power, which supposes authority in him who inflicts it. It follows on an act of the judicial power, which itself follows only on an act of legislative power. The three powers are united in the Pope.

The Gallicans, even, who denied the Pope's infallibility, always recognised his legislative, judicial, and coercitive powers; his right to punish princes whenever they abused their civil jurisdiction. Gerson, for example, wrote: "All men, princes and others, are subject to the Pope, in so far as they might choose to make a bad use of their jurisdictions, temporality, and dominion, in contravention of the Divine and Natural Law."

This jurisdiction or authority was not exercised by the Pope alone, but streamed down from him to the bishops in their sees, and from the bishops to the priests in their parishes. We learn from Cardinal Matthieu that the bishops, before the time of Constantine, used to act as arbitrators in disputes, so as to obviate the necessity of "going to law, and that, too, before unbelievers." From the time of Constantine their jurisdiction was recognised by the State. Before Constantine, the episcopal sentence was enforced only by the inherent authority of justice and the consent of the parties; but after Constantine the episcopal judgment had the force of civil law; and either party in a dispute might refuse to be judged in a secular court, and thus bring the matter before the episcopal court. In the year 368, Valentinian and Valens [Cod. Just., lib. i., tit. iv.] gave the bishops the charge of preventing frauds by merchants and traders, and of exacting reparation if any fraud had been committed. Subsequently the emperors extended this power to all cases in which the poor, the weak, or prisoners, or persons who were otherwise helpless, had suffered any injury. Soon the bishops were made the civil governors, and even civil legislators of towns, the heads of the police, the guardians of the municipal purse, the surveyors and judges of weights and measures. [Cod. Just., lib. i., tit. iv.]

The Council of Sardica (which declared that the *final* judgment, or judgment without appeal, in major causes, did not lie in the bishops, but that an appeal might be had to the Pope) was held in the year 347. But it appears from Pope Innocent's letter that such an appeal to the Pope, in the graver cases, was "an ancient custom" even in the year A.D. 404. For he wrote in that year to the Archbishop of Rouen—"If grave cases are brought into judg-

ment, the bishop's sentence may be passed, but a reference must then be allowed to the Apostolic See, as the Sardican Synod ordered, and as the *ancient* custom requires."

That was the remedy for the evils of society which was prepared by Jesus Christ. Now let us see how it worked.

Before narrating a few examples, I must briefly allude to some of the means employed by the coercitive power in its action. From the time of the persecutions, shortly after the end of the third century, the Church ordained various humiliating practices of public penance for sinners guilty of any grievous mortal sin, however secret. Such a public penance disqualified the sinner, at least until he had been reconciled with the Church, from holding any civil office, from engaging in secular affairs, or attending a feast, or returning to the army, or pleading in any legal court, or embarking in commerce. It also imposed the duty of perfect chastity on married persons and celibacy on the unmarried. This disciplinary system was in complete vigour until the eighth century, when it became relaxed; but it was somewhat revived, owing to an increase of moral laxity, in the twelfth century. The sentence of excommunication was the severest ecclesiastical punishment. The excommunicated person was outlawed from human society; and no one, not even a relative, was allowed to hold intercourse with him, except for the mere indispensable necessities of life; he was declared infamous, and lost all civil rights; and, in cases of obduracy, was deprived of his property in favour of his legitimate heir. He might not even enter a church, nor might any Christian eat with him. [See, for example, the Constitution of Childebert, A.D. 595; and the Council of Verneuil, A.D. 755; and the Constitution of Ethelred, King of England, A.D. 1008; and the Laws of Canute, &c.] M. Guizot, a Protestant, in his 6th Lecture on the History of Civilization, writes: "The Church worked hard, and in a most efficacious manner for the amelioration of the social state. . . . There is among the institutions of the Church, one which generally passes with too little notice: I speak of her penitentiary system—a system which is, in these days, a curious subject of study, seeing that her principles and her applications of penal justice were completely in accordance with the ideas of philosophy. If you study the punishments awarded by the Church—the public penances, for example, which were her principal chastisements—you will observe that they were calculated to excite a feeling of contrition in the mind of the guilty person; and, in the minds of the spectators, a wholesome fear at his example."

Let me now enumerate a few facts from history, in order to show how the Church worked for the amelioration of society. We divided, under four heads, the evils which called for remedy:

- (1.) Oppression of the poor.
- (2.) Moral turpitude or debauchery.
- (3.) Lawlessness or injustice.
- (4.) Wars.

(1.) The oppression of the poor, in the earliest days of Christianity, appeared as the institution of slavery. The Church freed the slave. She attacked the evil at the root—not by inciting the slaves to revolt, for in no case was any violence used; but by working upon the minds and principles of the masters. As early as the second century, Hermes, the Prefect of Rome, was converted to Christianity by Pope Alexander; his slaves, to the number of 1250, were also converted, and, on receiving the sacrament of baptism, were proclaimed freemen and brothers. Under Diocletian, another Prefect of Rome was converted, and manumitted 1,400 slaves, in like manner. For the Church made the manumission of slaves a religious duty and a religious service. Before the altar of sacrifice, the master pronounced these words: “In the name of God, and for the good of my soul, for the redemption of my sins, and in the hope that the Lord will deign to pardon me, I set at liberty my slave, named M. or N. From this day let him be free as if he had been born of free parents. Let all that he can gain and accumulate by his work and by the grace of Christ be his property;” and so forth.

The Council of Orange, A.D. 441, forbade, under pain of excommunication, the reduction to slavery again of anyone whom the Church had freed. Another Council, shortly afterwards, directed that any slave who should take refuge in a church, even if he had committed a fault, should not be rendered up to his master, unless the master should take an oath not to do him any harm.

A Council in A.D. 517 pronounced excommunication on everyone who should kill a slave without trial and the sentence of a judge.

By such action, continued through many centuries, slavery was at last abolished.

It would take too much time to explain the constant endeavours of the Church to ameliorate the condition of poor working men. I will here merely mention one fact of enormous significance. The jurisdiction—which streamed down from the Head of the Church, through the whole hierarchy of bishops throughout the world, to the priests of the Universal Church—was everywhere employed in protecting the poor man from injustice and oppression, and furnishing him with a court where he could, without expense, establish his rights against the rich and powerful. Thus Möhler [*Manual of the Hist. of the Middle Ages*] writes: “Whoever had cause of complaint against the emperor, or against the king who was his more immediate ruler, had the right to cite the oppressor before the tribunal of the Holy See. The emperor, on the

other hand, and the other princes had, on the very same ground, the right to claim that justice should be done at Rome against their recalcitrant vassals." The Protestant historian and statesman, M. Guizot, alludes to the same system of universal justice [*"Cours d'Histoire Moderne,"* No. 6], and says: "From the miserable dwelling of the serf, which stood at the foot of the great feudal castle, up to the presence of the sovereign, everywhere there was a priest. He was associated with all ranks and conditions of men. . . . The bishops—the chiefs of the Christian clergy—were, moreover, engaged in a feudal organization; they were at the same time members of a civil and of an ecclesiastical hierarchy."

(2.) Let this much suffice for a subject on which an interesting volume might be written. We must pass to the second head, namely, moral turpitude. In turning hastily over the pages of history, we find Pope Nicholas the Great carrying on a contest with Lothaire II., King of Lorraine (the son of the Emperor Lothaire I., and grandson of Louis le Débonnaire, who had himself been deposed by the French bishops in the year 833). Why had the Holy See this contest with the king? Because his majesty was about to put away his lawful wife, Teutberga, and marry Waldrade, with whom he had been carrying on an illicit commerce; and the Pope, not being worldly-minded, was zealous to prevent the commission of crime in high places as well as in the lower ranks of society. The Pope was successful. But after the death of Nicholas I., Lothaire resumed his guilty intention. Pope Adrian II. was of the same mind as his predecessor, and in the year 869 excommunicated the king, and all who were privy to the design. The king thereupon made haste to submit, and was absolved, on his swearing that he had forever renounced Waldrade. But he swore falsely; and died within a month. In the year 998, we find that Pope Gregory V., in like manner, excommunicated King Robert, for his incestuous marriage with Bertha.

The Emperor Henry IV. had filled his palace with the frail victims of his debauches, and was about to put away his wife Praxedes. Pope Alexander II. intervened to protect the rights of the lawful wife, and prevent so great a wrong from being perpetrated by the most powerful man of the time. In the year 1088, St. Gregory VII., and again in the year 1094, Pope Urban II., excommunicated Philip I., King of France, for an adulterous intercourse, and then an unlawful marriage with Bertrade. King Philip had poisoned his Queen Bertha, and married the notorious Bertrade de Montfort. The Pope, on hearing of it, rebuked him; and as he did not become penitent, he was excommunicated. Four years later (in the year 1098) the same Pope Urban II. excommunicated King Philip II. for his adulterous connection with Agnes de Méranie. In 1213, Pope Innocent III. had to put all

France under an interdict, until King Philip Augustus took back his wife Ingerberg. He also constrained the King of Leon, in Spain, to separate from his niece, whom he had incestuously married. Let me cite one more example nearer home. In 1534, Pope Clement VII., after most earnest paternal entreaties to King Henry VIII. to dismiss his concubine, Anna Boleyn, and take back his lawful wife, at last excommunicated him. In December, 1538, Pope Paul III., finding him obdurate, cited him to appear at Rome within three months, to submit himself to the judgment of the Holy See. As he disobeyed this citation, the Pope not only repeated the excommunication, but forfeited the king's right to reign, and absolved all his subjects from their allegiance. We all know that the origin of the Anglican Church was a consequence of the king's immorality.

(3.) We must now hurry on to the third head—lawlessness or injustice. M. Guizot, the statesman and historian, writes these words in his second lecture :—"If the Christian Church had not existed, the whole world would have been delivered over to mere brute force. She alone exerted a moral power. She did more ; she observed, and she inculcated the idea of rule, the idea of a law above all human laws. She herself professed this belief (so essential to the rescuing of humanity), that there is, above all human laws, a law which . . . is, at all times and in all places, the same law. . . . There was another cause which also led to the same result : the frightful condition of the temporal order of things, the violence, the iniquity which was dominant in the secular government of all societies. Lately persons have talked at their ease of 'the rights of the secular power ;' but at the period with which we are engaged, the secular power was simply brute force—an intractable brigandage. The Church . . . was infinitely superior to such a secular power ; the earnest cry of the people was ever urging her to take the place of the secular power. . . . Generally speaking, whenever men lost their liberties, it was the Christian Church which undertook to restore those liberties. In the tenth century, nowhere was the people able to defend itself, and to establish its rights in the face of the violence of the State ; the Church then interfered in the name of Heaven."

Before narrating examples of the remedial influence of the Holy See, I desire to make a quotation from another historian, who is not only Protestant, but also most bitter against the Catholic Church. In Mr. Froude's first volume, we read these words :—"In the Middle Ages, a lofty effort had been made to overpass the common limitations of government, to introduce punishments for sins as well as crimes, and to visit with temporal penalties the breach of the moral law. The punishment best adapted for such

offences was some outward expression of the disapproval with which good men regard acts of sin ; some open disgrace ; some spiritual censure ; some suspension of the communion with the Church, accompanied by other consequences practically inconvenient, to be continued until the offender had made reparation, or had openly repented, or had given confirmed proof of amendment. The administration of such a discipline fell, as a matter of course, to the clergy. The clergy were the guardians of morality ; their characters were a claim to confidence ; their duties gave them opportunities of observation which no other men could possess ; while their priestly office gave solemn weight to their sentences. Thus arose, throughout Europe, a system of spiritual surveillance over the habits and conduct of every man, extending from the cottage to the castle, taking note of all wrong-dealing, of all oppression of man by man, of all licentiousness and profligacy, and representing upon earth, in the principles by which it was guided, the laws of the great tribunal of Almighty God.

“Such was the origin of the Church Courts, perhaps the greatest institutions ever yet devised by man. . . . Each private person was liable to be called in question for every action of his life ; and an elaborate network of canon law, perpetually growing, enveloped the whole surface of society. . . . The misdemeanours of which these courts took cognizance—[See also Hale’s *Criminal Causes*, from the Records of the Consistory Court of London]—were ‘offences against chastity, heresy, or matter sounding thereunto, witchcraft, drunkenness, scandal, defamation of character, impatient words, broken promises, untruths, &c., &c.’ . . . Workmen were not allowed to take advantage of the scantiness of the labour market to exact extravagant wages, and capitalists were not allowed to drive the labourers from their holdings and destroy their healthy independence, &c.” Those are the words of Mr. Froude.

I will now call your attention to a few historical examples under this head. In the year 380 the city of Thessalonica revolted, and put the governor to death. The emperor, as soon as he had received intelligence of this catastrophe, gave an order, in anger, that the citizens of Thessalonica should be exterminated. Presently milder counsels prevailed with him, and he revoked his sanguinary decree. His second messenger, however, arrived too late : for vengeance had already been taken. The emperor was at Milan, and St. Ambrose, the archbishop, wrote to him a warning that the Holy Sacrifice would not be offered in his presence, as his imperial majesty’s soul was stained with blood-guiltiness. Yet the emperor came, in the morning, to the church. St. Ambrose stood in the doorway, resolutely and fearlessly, and forbade the emperor to enter. The emperor thereupon sub-

mitted ; and when he had performed a severe penance he received absolution.

Pope Victor II. ascended the throne in the year 1054. After assembling the Council of Florence, he travelled to Germany, which was in revolt against the Emperor Henry III., in order to give peace to the empire, and to unite the Imperial family, which was torn by intestine quarrels. The emperor died (in 1056), after appointing the Pope as Regent, and guardian of Henry IV. The Pontiff then succeeded in uniting all the princes of Germany in friendly alliance, gaining for himself a loving reverence from each one ; for they all saw in him the Supreme Father of all, and a just arbiter in all their dissensions.

Henry IV. had, however, a most cruel, violent, haughty, and lawless temper, which the mildness of the Pope utterly failed to calm. We shall presently find, therefore, that he was excommunicated by Gregory VII. for oppressing his subjects.

About this time, Vezelin led a rebellion in Dalmatia against Demetrius, his king ; but Gregory VII. stopped his lawless career by these words : "We are exceedingly astonished that, after having long since promised to be a vassal to St. Peter and to us, you now attempt to rise up against him whom the Apostolical authority has appointed King of Dalmatia. We, therefore, in the name of St. Peter, prohibit you to take arms against the king ; because, whatever you do against him, you do against the Holy See itself. If you have any grounds of complaint, you should ask justice of us, and wait for our decision. Otherwise, know that we will draw against thee the sword of St. Peter, to punish thine audacity, and the temerity of all those who shall favour thee in this enterprise." A short time previously the Saxon people refrained from rising against their oppressor, but appealed to Pope Alexander II. for justice against the emperor for his tyranny. The Pope judged their case, and excommunicated the emperor's evil counsellors, menacing the emperor himself with a like infliction, unless he should govern somewhat more in accordance with the laws of God.

In the year 1073, we find St. Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) rebuking the Emperor Henry IV. for his excessive tyrannies, and endeavouring to recall him from his evil ways. The emperor refused to listen to the paternal warning, but was obdurate in his oppressions and crimes. The Pontiff then pronounced the sentence of excommunication. Presently he gave him absolution, on the condition that he would submit his conduct, in accordance with the laws of the empire, to a General Assembly of the German barons, and to the final judgment of the Holy See. The emperor shrank from the verdict of his barons. Four years later this great and holy Pope met the emperor at Canossa, near Reggio. While

celebrating the Divine office, the Pontiff stopped short, and, holding up the Blessed Sacrament in his hands, with eyes upturned to heaven, he solemnly swore that, as he looked for eternal salvation, he had never acted but with a pure intention for the glory of God and the happiness of the people. He then called aloud upon the emperor, before the assembled multitude, to swear the same. The emperor could not swear it, and was denied the Blessed Sacrament. St. Gregory VII. soon afterwards wrote a Brief, saying that he would teach rulers that no true sovereign is ever a tyrant ; and (said he) "we will furnish sovereigns with weapons of humility, whereby they may be able effectually to war against the spirit of pride."

In the same year (1073), the Saxon people again complained of continued oppressions, and joined the princes of Germany in aiming at the deposition of the Emperor Henry, and the election of Rudolf, Duke of Suabia, in his stead. Gregory VII. hastened to order a suspension of arms, until he had fully investigated and judged the quarrel, and decided what would be just and right.

In the year 1211, that great Pope, Innocent III., excommunicated John, King of England, and pronounced against him a sentence of deposition for the murder of Prince Arthur.

In 1216, Pope Honorius III. commenced his reign by bringing about a peace between Henry III., King of England, and his revolted barons.

In 1230, we find the Emperor Frederick II., Red-beard or Tile-beard (who had just made his submission to Pope Gregory IX., and had promised amendment for the future), returning to his former evil course of tyrannies and exactions. Genoa, Milan, and Venice appealed to the Pope to save them. The Pontiff, after finding entreaties to be of no avail, again excommunicated Frederick. That was in the year 1239. Frederick replied by ravaging Italy, and committing the most atrocious cruelties. Pope Innocent IV. called a General Council at Lyons (1245), and cited Frederick to appear. At this Council the emperor was excommunicated and deposed.

In 1275, King Demetrius was driven by rebels from the throne of Russia, and appealed for justice to Pope Gregory X., as the Supreme Judge and Universal Father of all Christians. In the next year, Pope Innocent V. laboured successfully to make peace between the towns of Pisa and Lucca, which were at feud, and to calm excited passions in Florence, where blood had begun to flow in civil broils.

In a few years (1282) Pope Martin IV. excommunicated Peter III., King of Arragon, for usurping Sicily (as Prussia a few years ago usurped Hanover), and deposed him from both those thrones.

Edward II. and Richard II. of England were also, in the preceding century (says De Maistre), formally judged and condemned in the regular courts of the Holy See. After Gaveston was killed by Thomas, Duke of Lancaster, grandson of Henry III. (1312), the flames of civil war were lighted up between Edward II. and his barons. The Pope put an end to the civil war and reconciled the two parties. A few years later, Pope John XXI. charged the Bishops of Dublin and of Cashel to endeavour to put an end to the revolt in Ireland. The Irish fully acknowledged the authority of the Holy See, as they always have done, and, I think, always will do, but addressed to him a memoir of their grievances. The Pontiff wrote (A.D. 1317) to the king in their favour, and the king promised, in reply, that the Irish should be no more oppressed, but should be treated with justice and gentleness.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Emperor Wenceslaus was deposed by the Pope, because he was "negligent of his trust, unworthy and useless."

In 1570 (February 25), Pope Pius V. issued a Bull against Queen Elizabeth for persecuting the Catholics; but the obdurate queen was relentless.

The Church similarly endeavoured to put down the practice of duelling. We find, for example, a decree of the Council of Trent (Sess. 25. De Reform., cap. xix.) in these words:—"The emperor, kings, dukes, marquises, counts, and all temporal lords, who permit duels on their properties, are, *ipso facto*, excommunicated and deprived of their jurisdiction over that city, castle, or place, in or near which they have permitted the duel, if such places are held under the Church; and, if they be feoffs, those feoffs immediately revert to the direct lord. . . . As to the duellists and their seconds, they incur excommunication, the confiscation of all their property, and perpetual infamy."

Almost as soon, indeed, as the Church had issued from the grievous persecutions by which she was nearly crushed during the first three centuries, she applied herself resolutely to put down the resort to violence which was then the custom. Thus the Council of Arles (A.D. 443), in its 50th canon, interdicted the use of the Church and the advantages of the sacraments to all persons who had quarrelled, until they became sincerely reconciled. Ten years later, the Council of Angers, in its 3rd canon, more strongly denounced every act of violence. The Council of Agde, in Languedoc (A.D. 506) decreed, in the 31st canon, that if two persons who had quarrelled should refuse to hear and obey the judgment of the priest for determining the quarrel, they should be *ipso facto* excommunicated. The Council of Lerida (A.D. 546) ordered, in the 7th canon, that he who has sworn to pursue an enemy until death, shall be under sentence of excommunication until he has done

penance for the sinful oath, and become heartily reconciled with his enemy. The 41st canon of the Council of Worms (A.D. 868) excommunicated all persons who refused to lay aside their quarrels and become friends. By the Council of Canterbury (A.D. 560) three British kings were excommunicated; Monric, King of Glamorgan, for killing King Cinetha; King Morcant, for killing Tiac, his uncle; and King Guidnert, for killing his brother, who was a competitor for his throne. These hardy Britons, however, submitted, did penance, and received absolution.

In the days when feudal barons levied private war upon each other, "The Truce of God" was made a law of the Church; it ordained that no attack was to be made, and no violence should be committed, and no fighting should take place on any of the days of religious solemnity, nor from Friday morning until Monday morning. The result of a violation of the Truce of God was excommunication and banishment. By the Council of Narbonne (A.D. 1045) the Truce was extended to the periods between the first Sunday in Advent and the Octave of the Epiphany, between Quinquagesima Sunday and the Octave of Easter, between the Sunday before Ascension and the Octave of Pentecost, and also to all fast days and the greater saints' days. It was also made to apply to shepherds with their flocks, at all times of the year, and to all houses within thirty paces of any church. Moreover, all men were forbidden to take any steps to procure redress by violence, or to make reprisals, until their case had been heard and judged by the bishop. This was a great step to be secured in days when rights were always determined by force, when men regarded might as right, and it was held as mean not to revenge by violence any insult or injury.

Pope Alexander II. confirmed the Truce of God in the year 1068. In the year 1095 Pope Urban II. extended it from every Thursday (instead of Friday) until Monday; also to an enemy who, when pursued, should take refuge under a cross. He also decreed that every person, on reaching the age of twelve years, should take a solemn oath to observe the Truce of God. Pope Calixtus II. confirmed it at Rheims (A.D. 1119); and it was again enforced by the Council of Lateran (in 1123) and by Innocent II (in the year 1130). In the year 1195 a universal Truce was proclaimed for three years without intermission.

Everyone has heard of the two political factions called the Guelfs and the Ghibellines. Every city, every province, was divided by these rival factions, and was vexed by their murderous animosities. The impious race of the Hohenstauffen, and their agents, the Ghibellines, were, like the secret societies of these days, always busy fanning flames of hatred, and offering suggestions for resorting to violence and fury, in the interests of private ambition

or private gain. Their emissaries were in every place, secretly lighting up the fires of discord in the hearts of great feudal lords ; or in towns, or in the midst of the family circle, sowing distrust wherever it found that hatred had died out ; and corrupting, by artifices and lies, the fidelity which was due to the Pope. So says Cardinal Matthieu. What does he add ? "The mission of Papal Legates was everywhere to bring about peace and good-will among men. They proposed just terms to rival towns and rival factions, who were seeking to satisfy their thirst for private revenge . . . Somehow a cessation of strife was always brought about, and the towns or factions sent their deputies to the Holy See to receive the just terms of peace."

During this year (1874) the Carmelite Fathers have succeeded in putting an end to a feud which had long raged in the County of Limerick ; showing that the Church is, as ever, the Church of the God of Peace and Justice.

Before proceeding to the last head, I must allude to one recent example, when the Pope set himself resolutely against an infraction of law. When Napoleon I. had got all Europe into his power, he attacked our trade, in order to cripple our resources. Every secular government yielded concurrence and support to this illegal act of Napoleon. The Holy See alone, in all Europe (as we find in Cardinal Gonsalvi's life), refused to sanction those Berlin and Milan decrees, grounding his refusal on the maxim of international law, that every alliance which prohibits a country from holding intercourse with a nation from whom it had suffered no wrong, is unjust and illegal.

(4.) We must now cut short our examples under this head, and pass to the last head, namely, war between nations. If the Church, by her justice or righteousness, has raised society in respect to the other species of evil, still more can she judge justly in this. For the Universal Church must always be on both sides of every quarrel between States, and be implicated, by some of her children, with each party in a fight. She must, therefore, be impartial, as her voice commands, in the name of the God of Righteousness, her soldiers in the armies of both combatants, and her children on both their territories.

All wars must, in the case of each combatant, be either just or unjust. When a war is unjust or criminal, it is, as Pope Innocent III. asserted, the duty of the Church to censure it ; because, *qui tacet assentit*; and "if the watchman does not speak to warn the wicked man from his way, the wicked man will die in his iniquity ; but God will require his blood at the hand of the watchman" (Ez. xxxiii. 8) ; and St Thomas said : "Every power, or art, or virtue, to which the ultimate end belongs, must dispose of all things which relate to that end. But, carnal wars, against a

faithful people, must be referred to spiritual and divine good as their end ; of which the clergy are the appointed judges."

The cause of every war is crime ; for there must be two to make a fight, and one at least must be in the wrong. "But (you may say) may it not be doubtful on which side the right lies?" Precisely ; and if there is a doubt as to justice, it is a matter for the decision of a judge, and not for violence. In former days, as we have seen, when feudal barons had a dispute, their only thought of settlement was a duel or a street fight. The Church put an end to those resorts to violence, by bringing the matter for judgment. If two claimants in these days have a dispute, it is sent before a judge. No one dreams of arming adherents to test the point. So in the affairs of nations, wars used frequently to be prevented by the judgment of that Authority whom Christ set over the whole commonwealth or federation of nations called Christendom, or the Christian Church.

In the year 476, Odoacer, the Arian, having conquered Italy, and overturned the Western Empire, concluded, at the instance of St. Severinus, the Pope, a secure peace for a space of eleven years. In 590, St. Gregory the Great terminated the war between the Lombards and the emperor. Cardinal Matthieu says of him : "The confidence of the whole world made him become, during the thirteen years of his Pontificate, the universal arbiter of peace and war." Gibbon, speaking of the origin of the temporal power of the Popes, said that St. Gregory had saved Italy from bloodshed and destruction, and therefore had the best of titles to a supreme authority.

Pope Zacharias (A.D. 741) went out with his bishops and clergy to meet Luitprand, King of the Lombards, and made that monarch spare the effusion of blood and conclude a peace with Italy and the Duchy of Rome for a period of twenty years. Luitprand then turned his arms against the Exarch of Ravenna, and took from him many provinces. The Pope hastened to the spot, and, acting with great energy, he stopped the war, saved Ravenna, and procured the restoration of the conquered provinces. Astolphus, the next King of the Lombards, broke the peace of Pope Zacharias, seized Istria, Ravenna, and other provinces, and prepared to attack the Duchy of Rome. The Pope caused him to conclude a peace for forty years. In four months Astolphus broke the peace, and the Pope had to fly for refuge to France. King Pepin instantly prepared to make war on Astolphus. The Pope however restrained his ardour, and enjoined him to offer peace, three times, on the condition that Astolphus should restore the towns which he had unjustly seized. A fourth time restitution was demanded ; for, at the very last, the Pope wrote, conjuring Astolphus to do justly, and thus save the effusion of blood. Astolphus refused to hear

of justice, and his army was cut to pieces. Cardinal Orsi, who mentions this fact, asserts that the Pope acted eminently in support of the rules of morality and the law of nations.

On the death of Astolphus (in 756), there were two claimants to the throne, the brother of Astolphus and the Duke of Tuscany. War was on the point of breaking out, and the Franks and Lombards were ranging themselves on opposite sides, when Pope Stephen II. put an end to the strife, by investigating the case and pronouncing a judgment in favour of the duke. This Pope was consulted, as Supreme Judge, by peoples and sovereigns of the whole world; and the justice of his judgments enforced respect to his decisions.

Pope Lando filled the Papal chair for only five months; yet during that time he succeeded in effecting a peace between Berengarius, King of Italy, and King Rudolf of Germany, who were competitors for the Imperial throne.

In 914 John X. succeeded to the Papal throne. He caused the Princes of Capua, Spoleto, Salerno, and Benvenuto, to lay aside their animosities and enter into a close alliance; thus securing peace for the whole peninsula of Italy.

Under Pope John XV. (A.D. 990), Ethelred, King of Wessex, had a quarrel with Richard, Duke of Normandy. The question at issue was investigated by the Pope, who sent a legate with a letter to Normandy, and a letter of admonition to the English king. In these letters the Pope "testified his sorrow that his spiritual sons should strive together, and conjured all the faithful in their respective kingdoms, for the love and fear of Almighty God and of St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and in obedience to his own fatherly admonition, to agree to a lasting peace with all men now and thereafter, without reserve or deception." So the English monarch sent an embassy to Normandy, and the terms of "a perpetual peace, which should never be disturbed," were arranged. They also bound themselves by a clause in the treaty, that "if at any time afterwards either of them should consider himself wronged, the case should be submitted to the Pope, and the wrong-doer should thereupon make restitution, so that peace shall never more be broken." They then swore, on the Blessed Sacrament, to preserve that treaty inviolate for ever. Before William of Normandy ventured to invade England, his grievance was submitted to the jurisdiction of the Pope; and it was not until the Pope had declared the justice of his cause that he embarked (1066) on the campaign.

Pope Calixtus II. succeeded Pope Gelasius in the year 1119. He at once summoned a General Council at Rheims, which heard and investigated for him the cases of many princes, who were then at war, as well as the complaint of the Countess of Poitiers, who

had been deserted by her husband. Two years later, having subdued the Emperor's Antipope, he applied himself, with great address, to reconcile with each other the warring princes of Germany.

During the reign of Pope Alexander III., says Baronius (1161), King Louis of France and Henry II. of England, collected "immense armies," and took the field. A sanguinary battle was imminent, when a legate arrived from the Pope, and examined the grounds of the quarrel, and made peace, by pronouncing judgment in the Pope's name. Each of these sovereigns thereupon assembled the bishops in their respective kingdoms, and recognised Alexander III. as "the true Bishop of the Holy Catholic Church," and proclaimed Octavianus, who was the Emperor Frederick's Antipope, to be "no better than a usurper."

When Pope Alexander III. returned to Rome (in 1165), after his exile of three years in France, he united the warring towns and principalities of Italy in a league of amity, and caused them all to swear to observe it inviolate for twenty years.

Pope Innocent III. mounted the throne of St. Peter A.D. 1198. There were three pretenders to the Imperial crown. The Pope considered their claims and pronounced in favour of Otho. His Bull proves the extent to which he had mastered the details. Bloodshed was stopped also in Hungary by his decision between the rival claims of two competitors for that throne.

At the accession of John, King of England, a war broke out with Philip of France. John appealed to the Pope, who sent over a Cardinal Legate to investigate and judge the case; and thus the war was averted. Two years after, John broke the peace. The Pope sent the Abbot of Casamari as his legate, writing to the two kings and to the archbishops of England and France. These and subsequent letters are given at length by Reynaldus. In one of them the Pontiff reminds Philip that the Pope's office was the Gospel of peace; that the angels who announced our Lord's birth had said that the effect of the Church would be to make peace between men of good will; and that the gift of our Lord to St. Peter was peace; and that our Lord had said of those who should refuse to receive His messengers of peace: "It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment." He continued in these words: "Besides, no one denies, that what pertains to the salvation or damnation of souls belongs to us, and is our function; yet nothing leads to damnation so much as the production of discords, the spilling of blood, the causing of so much misery, &c. And remember the injunction of the Gospel: 'If thy brother shall have sinned against thee, take him apart and speak to him, and if thou shalt make peace thou wilt have gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, take with thee two or three more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established;

and if he then will not hear them, tell it to the Church ; and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican.' Now the King of England is your brother, not in the flesh, but in the unity of the faith ; . . . so if you will not hear the Church, what shall I do ? Shall I fear to offend you or to offend God ? I will proclaim you a heathen man and publican. But if you argue that you did not offend against him (King John), but he against you, what then shall we do ? We must make a more searching inquiry, and, having learned the truth, we shall proceed as the Lord has commanded," &c.

The legate heard the complaints of each, and showed to each king the particular wrongs that he had done, and urged each to make reparation. Thus the evil was averted. A few years afterwards the same Pope brought about, in like manner, a peace between Henry III. of England and Philip Augustus of France ; and in 1281 Pope Nicholas III. caused France and Castile to cease from war. At the end of this century, Pope Nicholas IV., by the Treaty of Tarascon, terminated the quarrel which had subsisted for a long time between the Houses of Anjou and Arragon ; a quarrel which had begun with the Sicilian Vespers, had troubled many princely families, and had made South Italy the arena for sanguinary struggles.

In 1294 all Europe was shaken by a great war between Philip le Bel, King of France, and the Dukes of Brabant and of Savoy, and the Earl of Brittany, on the one side ; and Edward I. of England, with the Kings of Scotland and of Norway, on the other side. Adolf of Nassau, one of the claimants for the imperial throne, sided with England ; while the other claimant, Albert of Austria, fought on the side of France. Pope Boniface VIII. instantly stepped between the combatants and offered mediation. His offer was rejected. He thereupon cited both parties before his tribunal to answer for all their unjust deeds ; he then published (1296) a Bull in which he forbade all men to pay any subsidies towards the war. He also threatened with excommunication every person who should attempt to levy subsidies ; and he laid under interdict every town which should hand over subsidies to either side. The Pope then sent a Bull in which he reminded each monarch that he had to respect justice, and make due reparation for the exactions and violences which his subjects had suffered from him. A council, moreover, met in the year 1302, on November 1st, at Rome, when the famous Bull, "*Unam Sanctam*," was promulgated. This Bull unfolds the distinction between the spiritual and temporal powers, and shows the proper subordination of the latter to the former. Albert of Austria had by this time killed his rival, Adolf of Nassau ; and was immediately struck by the Pontiff, with the sentence of excommunication.

In the year 1317, John XXI. effected a peace between Edward II. of England and Robert Bruce of Scotland. Two subsequent wars between the English and Scotch were also ended by the judgments of the Pope's legates.

During the reign of Pope Clement VI. war was declared between Edward III. of England and Philip VI. of France. For Louis of Bavaria had made an offensive alliance with the King of England and with the Princes of Flanders, conspiring with them to make war upon France. Such an alliance was unjust and contrary to international law; because it was not *necessary* for each of these powers, in self-defence and the support of right. The Pope immediately examined into the matter, and passed judgment upon it, anathematizing Louis, the instigator of the plot (A.D. 1346). Three years later, Louis of Hungary laid claim to the crown of Naples, and at once levied war to obtain it. The Pope went minutely into the merits of the claim, reviewing carefully every point. He then ordered the King of Hungary to retire from the war. Dissensions broke out the same year between the Genoese and Venetians, the two great naval powers of the time. This dispute also was judged by the Pope, and war was prevented. When Gregory XI. ascended the throne (in 1370), a war was imminent between France and England. The Pope was prepared to adjudicate, but his voice was unheeded, and much loss and bloodshed resulted. He prevented, however, another war between the King of Castile and Ferdinand, King of Portugal, by his judgment and sentence on the cause of quarrel. Soon afterwards he reconciled Castile with Navarre and Arragon; and put an end to the strife between Sicily and the King of Naples.

In the year 1436 the Portuguese prepared to go to war with the Moors of Tangier. Pope Eugenius IV. gave the matter a careful consideration in council, and then wrote:—"War would be just, and therefore permissible, only so far as Portugal should be *compelled* to fight for self-preservation; otherwise war would be unjust and damnable, &c." The Portuguese heeded not, but entered on the unjust war, and were defeated, and the Infante Ferdinand was made captive by the Moors.

The battle of Bosworth was fought in 1485 between Richard III. and Henry VII. The latter, who was the victor, prayed Pope Innocent VII. to confirm his succession to the throne. The Pope investigated his claim, and issued a Bull, which is given at length in Bacon's History, confirming Henry's claim, and anathematizing any who should venture to stir up again the strife between the White and Red Roses, to which the marriage of Henry with the daughter of Edward IV. had offered a happy termination.

At the same period, Spain and Portugal had a serious quarrel about their respective possessions in the New World. Emmanuel was the King of Portugal, and Ferdinand and Isabella reigned in

Spain. These nations, however, referred the quarrel, and many other matters, out of which dispute might subsequently arise, to the judgment of the Head of the Church. Pope Alexander VI. investigated the case and published the Bull "*inter cetera*," which awarded to Spain all the territory to the east of a certain line, and to Portugal all that to the west. The sword was sheathed, and to this day those respective territories are held by the successors of those whose strife was thus happily averted. The Pope also confirmed to Spain her conquests in Algiers and Tunis; and to Portugal her conquests in Fez and Morocco. The same Pontiff promulgated the Bull "*In cœnâ Domini*," which Count de Maistre looked upon as the model of good policy; saying that if it had been accepted, as it should have been, the world would to this day have had an international police and an unvarying code of international law. The 5th article hit a great blow at the practice of war, by placing under sentence of excommunication every ruler who should impose new taxes or increase old taxes, except in cases provided for by the constitution of the country, or, in unforeseen contingencies, by dispensation from the Holy See, after due investigation and judgment.

Pope Clement VIII. mediated between France and Spain, and secured peace by the Treaty of Vervins, in 1598. Sixty-nine years later, Pope Clement IX. again reconciled these two great nations.

When war was declared between France and Prussia in 1870, the present Pontiff desired to prevent the effusion of blood, by an exertion of his supreme judicial power. Napoleon III. spurned his mediation with a sneer; and Napoleon lost his throne, within the year, amid the sneers of the world.

In the pictures handed down to us by historians, we have witnessed each Pope rescuing the world from its debasement and barbarism, and then, as a colossus of moral power, standing up amid a jarring world of littleness and vice. We have seen him as the Supreme Legislator for Christendom, the Supreme Judge in the last resort of political acts, and the Source of Order throughout the world; as the councillor of kings, and the arbiter between nations; checking the passions of peoples, and the tyrannies of rulers; nipping in the bud those seditions and tumults, those wars and rumours of wars which have burdened nations with taxes, and filled Europe with widows, and the world with wail. We have seen him interposing to stay the hand of the victor, and to save the vanquished from vengeance. We have seen him exhorting sovereigns to act with mildness towards their subjects, and urging subjects not to rebel against their sovereigns. We have seen him rebuking the mighty for their adulteries, and all men for their lawlessness. We have seen him free the slave, and taking in hand the cause of the poor; reforming abuses throughout Europe,

introducing a stricter discipline, stopping revenges, and interposing, with judgment and sentence, between mighty combatants. We have always seen the Pope as a protection for the weak against the strong, for the poor against those who oppressed them, for the people against powerful monarchs.

As, in those days, parishes and municipalities and corporations were independent republics, which were federated under the personal rule of the king ; so was each state a local autonomy or local government under the supreme authority of the Head of the Church. Christendom was the one commonwealth of God, or a federation of states under the Head of the Church.

In each state, again, the bishops judged in the same manner, and even guided the home policy of the nation ; while, in smaller spheres, the priests exercised the same jurisdiction in their respective parishes. Christendom was, in fact, a vast organism, "one body ;" and the people enjoyed liberty and a feeling of security, arising from a sense of law and justice. But now all this organization and this jurisdiction are despised. As long as men honoured their common Father and Mother, there were not wars and broils, and taxes and burdens ; and they lived long in the land which the Lord God had given them.

But kings became jealous of a power over them, which rebuked them for oppression, and stopped them from carrying out their schemes of injustice. Every powerful man hated this supremacy of the Pope, and the consequent jurisdiction of bishop and priest ; for he felt the restraint whenever he attempted to do a wrong ; therefore men determined to get rid of it ; "The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes met together (and said of the rulers of Christ's Church) : let us break their bonds asunder, and let us cast away their yoke from us." Arnolfo da Brescia's theorizing against the supreme authority of the Pope was condemned by Pope Innocent II. in 1139 ; but the Ghibellines adhered to his errors. The Council of Constance (1414) anathematized similar notions of Wicliffe, who was backed by John of Gaunt. More than a century later Luther persuaded men to love darkness rather than light, and the confusion of Satan more than the organization of the Church of God. And national churches were made, in order to break up and limit the Pope's primacy and power. But a national church can never condemn its national government, even when that government is oppressive, lawless, or unjust. It must always be subservient and an instrument of the ruler, to defend his acts, however bad. A national church is a licence for national wrong, and an apotheosis of the falsehoods of a government.

For the same reason, religious education has been supplanted by secular instruction, lest persons should be led to look for a

Church which is One, Holy, Catholic, and founded by the Apostles. What has been the effect? The foundations of morality have been undermined; and Communism, Socialism, and the International have grown up.

Have we, then, gained by refusing to honour the common Father of Christendom? Unjust wars have multiplied, and the taxation of every nation has become intolerable. Small states have been swallowed up by large ones; law and justice are despised; and every nation is arming and fortifying. These are called the days of civilization; and yet there are wars, and factions, and piracy, and murder, and concubinage, and adulteries, and every injustice.

What is the condition of each country? We see more than a million of paupers in England, who are treated as criminals; and poor workmen ground down and oppressed; and a labour question looming darkly in the future. We hear, from detectives, of swinish debauchery in the upper and middle classes. We see an utter disregard of law, and a total loss of the sense of justice; while the English papers are teeming with leading articles on "English Ruffianism." The *Saturday Review* said, the other day:—"It is undeniable, in the face of this evidence, that there is a deeply-rooted spirit of brutality among the lower classes of the population. . . . There is a vast amount of obscure ferocity and violence." Then it speaks of the American bowie-knife and the Italian stiletto, and adds that "the tone of some of our public men in recent years has afforded a dangerous encouragement to defiance of law and order." But these brutal outrages and murders and street fights, are nothing to the unrighteous wars, or murder by wholesale, which the newspapers applaud. Is not this the old malady of the world appearing again? Why should we not fly to the same cure, the same cistern of living water, the same Pool of Siloam, instead of hewing out for ourselves cisterns which are leaky and which will not hold water? Cardinal Antonelli wrote that the object of the Vatican Council was "to restore to the world that peace and prosperity which can only be found in the perfect keeping of the Divine law." In four Encyclicals and Allocutions [Nov. 9, 1846; Dec. 9, 1854; June 9, 1862, and Dec. 8, 1864] the present Pontiff expressed his desire again freely to exercise "that salutary influence which the Catholic Church, according to the institution and command of her Divine Author, should freely exercise even to the end of the world, not only over private individuals, but over nations, peoples, and their sovereign princes." In a Letter Apostolic of June 29, 1868, he deplored "the great evils with which civil society itself is afflicted," and the fact that "the supreme authority of the Holy See has been assailed and trodden under foot." Therefore he summoned the Vatican.

Council, being, to use the Holy Father's words, "grievously afflicted at the most sad condition both of sacred and of civil affairs. . . . Every effort must be made (he continued) that, by God's good help, all evils may be removed from the Church and from civil society. . . . For no one can deny that the power of the Catholic Church and of her doctrine not only regards men's eternal salvation, but also benefits the temporal welfare of the people; and that it promotes their true prosperity, order, and tranquillity, and also the progress and solidity of human sciences—as the annals of sacred and profane history, by conspicuous facts, clearly show, and constantly and evidently prove." And in the allocution to the assembled hierarchy, in the first session, on Dec. 2, 1869, the Holy Father said:—"The matter of which we have to treat is most important—namely, the discovery of remedies for so many ills which in these days disturb both Christian and civil society."

That is the view which the Holy Father has taken of society, and of the remedy which is necessary to heal its woes. Let me now, on the contrary, read you a sentence from a recent review—the October number of the "Contemporary Review." The words are as follows: "At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme (as converting the people of England to the Church of their forefathers) been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth, when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem*, a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history." This review has been written by a very eminent statesman; how came such words to be thrust in, out of place? They must have been slipped in—shall we say, by the occult influence of the printer's *devil*? The Church of Rome has not "substituted a change of faith" for her ancient *semper eadem*; because she is the eternal Church, the teacher of the truth of the Eternal God, which, therefore, cannot change. She has not resorted to "a policy of violence," for, as I have shown, she has ever laboured to establish and secure peace and good-will.

The "rusty tools" he speaks of, are the weapons with which Jesus Christ has provided His Church, bidding her to make war upon the world, the flesh, and the devil; but they are not "rusty tools," for they have come thence "where moth and rust do not corrupt," and belong to her against whom the gates of Hell shall not prevail.

It is, moreover, false to assert that converts to her "must renounce their moral and mental freedom, and place their civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another." My civil loyalty is greater and more steadfast now than before; because it *was* a sentiment, it is *now* a religious duty. But does not Protestantism cut at the root of loyalty? Is Protestantism not a revolt against authority, and the proclamation of a self-willed independence of all authority?

"Renounce our moral and mental freedom!" In arriving at the truth and embracing it, we renounce our mental freedom! Then if we continue to wander amid errors we exercise our mental freedom! If he believes the *Daily News*, or *Telegraph*, or *Reynolds'*, is he mentally free; while if I feel myself constrained to acknowledge the force of demonstration, say in Euclid's propositions, do I thereby renounce my mental freedom? In order to be mentally free must I persist in declining to allow that two and two make four, although I may give credence to the gossip of the day, and be free. Why, then, if I do not renounce my mental freedom in becoming the servant of mathematical truth, should I renounce my freedom in becoming the servant of the God of Truth and accepting His teaching, and believing revelation—in short, in becoming a faithful Christian?

"Ancient history" I have not repudiated; to ancient history I have this evening appealed. But I *have* repudiated modern thought, if the great leader of the liberal party means by modern thought the mischievous ideas of 1789, and, by fervour in religion, a little harmless artistic taste. I belong to the Church of God; not to the synagogue of Satan. I look to the Church to remove now, as she did in the early centuries, the evils of modern thought by the remedial agency of her plenitude of authority. For the world is now as it was after the ages of "planting" and "watering." The upper and middle classes are like the luxurious inhabitants of the Roman empire; while the poorer classes resemble their Gothic, German, and Frankish ancestors, who were mingled in the old Roman Empire. I am speaking in Ireland, where every word of respect and affection for the Holy Father and the Catholic Church is sure to meet with a ready and enthusiastic response; and I fear not to assert that the Divine remedy which proved successful in former centuries is that which is now needed to heal our woes.

A P P E N D I X.

Pope Innocent III., in a discourse, in full consistory, before the ambassadors of Philip of Suabia, who was candidate for the empire, against Otho, Duke of Saxony, used these words : “ To princes is given a power on earth, but priests have a power in heaven ; the influence of the former is over bodies alone, but the latter exert influence over souls as well as bodies. Wherefore, in as far as a soul is more worthy than the body, in so far is the priesthood superior to royalty The power of every prince is confined to his province ; and the power of every king is limited to his kingdom ; but Peter surpasses them all in the extent and fulness of his power, because he is the Vicar of Him of whom is the earth and the fulness thereof, the world, and all the inhabitants of it.”

In a letter to the Emperor Alexis Comnena, Innocent III. wrote : “ Moreover, you should know that ‘ God made two lights in the firmament of heaven,’ a greater light and a lesser light ; ‘ the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night.’ Both of them were great lights, but one was greater than the other ; because that, by the word ‘ heaven’ is prophetically designated the Church, in accordance with the words of the Truth : ‘ The kingdom of heaven is like to a father of a family, who in the morning conducted labourers into his vineyard.’ By ‘ day’ the spiritual power is denoted ; and by ‘ night’ the carnal power, according to the prophetic testimony : ‘ Day unto day uttereth the Word, and night to night declareth knowledge.’ For the firmament of heaven, therefore—that is, the firmament of the Universal Church—God made two great lights ; that is, He instituted two great dignities, which are the pontifical authority and the regal power ; but that which rules the day, or spiritual things, is greater ; and that which rules in carnal things is lesser. So that as the sun is to the moon, so is the difference between the pontiffs and kings. [Decretal, lib. i., tit. xxxiii., cap. vi.]

FROM THE BULL “ UNAM SANCTAM ” OF POPE BONIFACE VIII.,
A.D. 1302.

“ By the words of the Gospel we are taught that there are in the Church, and in her power, two swords, namely, the spiritual and the temporal Both of them are in the power of the Church—the spiritual sword and the material sword. The latter

however is drawn for the Church, while the former is unsheathed by the Church. The former is in the hand of the priest; the latter is held in the hand of kings and soldiers, attending on the commands, and restrained by the patience of the priest. Now it is necessary that the one sword should be under the other sword, and that the temporal authority should be subordinate to the spiritual power; for the Apostle says, 'There is no power except it be from God; but all things that exist are ordered by God.' But they would not be ordered unless the one sword were under the other sword, and were subordinate through the supremacy of the other Yet we must allow, without doubt, that the spiritual power is superior, both in dignity and excellence, to any earthly power, in so far as spiritual things excel temporal things. This is clearly shown, also, in the giving, and blessing, and sanctification of tithes, and in the conferring of the royal power on the king (at his coronation), and in the direction of earthly affairs; for, according to the testimony of the Truth, it is for the spiritual power to institute the earthly power, and to judge it, too, if it be blameworthy; because it is thus that Jeremiah's prophecy concerning the Church and ecclesiastical power is fulfilled: 'Lo, I have set thee this day over nations and kingdoms,' &c. Therefore, if the earthly power transgresses, it is to be judged by the spiritual power; but if a lesser spiritual power should err, it is to be judged by its own superior; but if the supreme spiritual power should err, it must be judged by God—it cannot be judged by man, as the Apostle teaches: 'The spiritual man judges all things, but he himself is judged by no man.' For this authority (although it has been given to a man, and is exercised by man) is not a human authority, but divine, in that it was given to Peter himself and to his successors, and firmly secured on Him whom he had confessed, by these words of our Lord Jesus to St. Peter: 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,' &c.; and, 'Whosoever therefore resisteth the power,' thus ordained by God, 'resisteth the ordination of God.'"

The doctrines thus set forth were carried fully into practice when Constantine came to the throne; and were maintained, for many centuries, with the assent and approval of the whole of Christendom. Thus we learn from Gosselin, for example:—

"For many centuries after the tenth, all the Catholic kingdoms of Europe constituted a sort of commonwealth, of which the Pope was the recognised head. In that capacity he decided both in councils and by himself, as supreme arbiter and judge in contests arising between princes and their subjects, or between princes among themselves; he cited sovereigns before his tribunal, and not only inflicted, on scandalous princes, spiritual censures, but even

deprived of their rank those who persisted obstinately in their disorders."

Again, Count Joseph de Maistre asserts in the most emphatic manner [Du Pape] :—

"We find that the Popes did effectively repress monarchs and protect the people; they allayed quarrels by a prudent intervention; they admonished sovereigns and subjects of their duties; and they struck with anathemas those great crimes which they found themselves unable to prevent."

We may also find royal and imperial examples of the same; for example, Edgar, King of England, in a discourse to St. Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury (A.D. 969), said :—

"It is time to rise against the transgressors of the law of God; the sword of Constantine is in my hand; the sword of St. Peter is in yours; let us take hands, and join sword to sword, and expel the lepers from the camp, and cleanse the sanctuary of the Lord. The royal power shall never be wanting to you to expel scandalous sinners from the Church, and to protect the just."—[Labbe. Concil. tom. ix., p. 697.]

In the Capitularies of Charlemagne, published in 805, at the Diet of Thionville, much the same is found.

Michaud, who tries to explain away the jurisdiction of the Popes, does much, on the contrary, unwittingly, to prove it divine. For he says :—"Is it not more natural to suppose that, in whatever great things they accomplished, the Popes merely obeyed the impulse of Christendom? During the Middle Ages—the epoch of their power—they rather obeyed than created that impulse. Their supreme power was *forced* on them by their position, not by their own will."

This view agrees with the three following propositions, which have been effectively proved by Gosselin :—

"(1.) The power of Popes and Councils over sovereigns during the Middle Ages, however extraordinary it may appear to us at present, was introduced naturally, and in some manner *inevitably*, by the state of society and the exigencies of the times. (2.) The Popes and Councils, when claiming and exercising this power, merely followed principles then authorized by *universal consent*. (3.) The universal consent, which attributed this power to them, was not founded on error, or on usurpation, but on the then existing constitutional law." [Gosselin's Power of the Pope in the Middle Ages, part ii., chap. i.]

The Protestant Sismondi bears this testimony :—"In the midst of the struggle concerning territorial jurisdictions, the Pope stood alone as the defender of the people and the peacemaker between feudatories."

So Voltaire says of that Pope who of all Popes has been

the most abused :—"The man who, perhaps of all men, most merited the gratitude of the whole human race, was Pope Alexander III. It was he who, in a council of the twelfth century, abolished slavery so far as he was able to do so. . . . He revised the rights of the people in every country, and repressed crime and immorality in rulers."

Leibnitz [De Actorum Publicorum Usu] wrote :—"It must be admitted that the vigilance of the Popes in enforcing the canons, and upholding ecclesiastical discipline, was productive, from time to time, of excellent consequences ; and that, by using their influence with kings, in season and out of season, either by remonstrances, which the authority of their office entitled them to make, or by the threat of ecclesiastical censures, they prevented many disorders." Again : "The arguments of Bellarmine—which prove from the position that the Popes have a jurisdiction in spirituals, that they also have a jurisdiction, at least indirect, over temporal things—appeared cogent even to Hobbes. . . . It matters little whether the Popes had this primacy by right divine or by a human right, so long as it is established that, during many centuries, they exercised a very extended power throughout the West, not only with universal consent, but with universal approbation. There are many Protestants even who have thought that it would be well still to leave this power in the hands of the Pope, and that it would prove useful in reforming abuses, &c. [Op : tom. iv., pars. iii.] It is no wonder that Leibnitz added [Opera, tom. v. 65] : "I am of opinion that there should be established, at Rome itself, a high tribunal for judging the quarrels of princes ; and that the Pope should be the president of it." Although a Protestant, yet Leibnitz had the intellect to see that much ; and the courage to confess it.

Chancellor Kent [*Commentaries on American Law*, vol. i., lecture i., p. 9 ; and see also the Preface to the third American edition of Wheaton's *International Law*] alludes in the following terms to the exercise of this very function by the Pope.

"There were five institutions existing about the period of the eleventh century, which made a deep impression upon Europe, and contributed, in a very essential degree, to improve the law of nations. . . . Of all these causes, the most weight is to be attributed to the intimate alliance of the Great Powers as one Christian community. . . . The history of Europe, during the early periods of modern history, abounds with interesting and strong cases, to show the authority of the Church over turbulent princes and fierce warriors, and the effect of that authority in ameliorating manners, checking violence, and introducing a system of morals which inculcated peace, moderation, and justice."

Wheaton says : "The influence of the Papal authority, though

sometimes abused, was then felt as a blessing to mankind : it rescued Europe from total barbarism ; it afforded the only asylum and shelter from feudal oppression." [*Hist. Law of Nations*, p. 33.]

And the Rev. John Lord, in his introductory essay to the *Chronicles of Sir John Froissart*, writes :

"Moreover, the Papacy was a great central power, needed to control the princes of Europe, and settle the difficulties which arose between them. The Popes, whatever may have been their personal character, were conservators of the peace. They preserved unity amid anarchy, and restrained the impulses of passionate kings." Again : "The Papacy, in the best ages, is thought by many profound historians to have been democratic in its sympathies. It guarded the interests of the people ; it preserved them from the violence of their oppressors ; it furnished a retreat, in monasteries, for the contemplative, the suffering, the afflicted, and the poor."

Pitt, in resisting the torrent of the French Revolution and afterwards the military despotism of Napoleon, which threatened to crush all Europe, looked to the Pope as the only real antagonist of the principles of the Revolution, and, therefore, the only mainstay of society. In this he was approved by Burke, by Windham, by Lord Moira, and others. A letter of Cardinal Zelada, secretary of state to Pope Pius VI., dated August 5, 1793, proves that the King of England had assured the Pontiff, through Lord Hood, that Great Britain was ready to protect the States of the Church against Napoleon. In 1794, Pitt opened negotiations with the Vatican. In May of that year, he suggested, through Mgr. De Conzié, Bishop of Arras, that the Pope should put himself at the head of a European league against the atheistic democracy of France. "On more than one occasion," said Pitt, "I have seen the Continental courts draw back before the divergences of opinion and of religion which separate us. I think that a common bond ought to unite us all. The Pope alone can be this centre." Again : "*We* are too much divided by personal interests or by political views. Rome alone can raise an impartial voice, and one free from all exterior pre-occupations. Rome, then, ought to speak according to the measure of her duties, and not merely of her good wishes, which no one doubts."

Pitt, in fact, very plainly saw that the only adequate antidote to the revolutionary ideas, was the Catholic Church and her doctrines. He therefore ordered the English ambassadors at all the courts of Europe, to press the sovereigns to whom they were accredited, to recognise the Pontiff as their Supreme Head and the bond of union between nations. He proposed thus to make a league of sovereigns, or federation of states under the Church, to resist the torrent of the Revolution. He thought that Russia and Prussia would follow the lead of England in joining the Pope, and

that Austria, Italy, South Germany, and Spain, would, as a matter of course, remember their ancient allegiance to the Holy Father; and he believed that their intrigues and conflicting interests, would, in the hour of supreme danger, give way before such a spiritual leadership.

In furtherance of this purpose, Pitt offered to receive a Papal Legate at St. James's, and to send an ambassador to Rome and a fleet to Civita Vecchia.

Guizot says: "The Christian Church had, in a manner, assailed barbarism on all points, to civilize by subduing it. In Spain, it was the Church herself that commenced the revival of civilization. There, instead of the old German assemblies, the assembly which takes the helm is the Council of Toledo; and though distinguished laymen assisted in it, the bishops were the ruling spirit. Open the code of the Visigoths; it is not a barbarian code: it was manifestly digested by the philosophers of the day, namely, by the clergy. It is replete with general principles, and with theories utterly unknown to barbarian customs. The Visigoth code, in a word, bears the impress of a learned, a social, and a systematic character. It is manifestly the work of the same clergy which guided the Councils of Toledo, and had so powerful an influence on the government of the country." [Guizot, *Hist. de la Civ. en Europe*, 3rd Lecture.]

"The Church had, moreover, mooted all the great questions which concern man. She was solicitous about all the problems of his nature, about all the chances of his destiny. Hence her influence on modern civilization has been immense, greater perhaps than has ever been imagined by her most ardent adversaries, or her most zealous advocates." [*Ibid.*, 5th Lecture.]

"As temporal prince, the Pope is equal to any other prince; but if to this we add his title of Supreme Head of Christendom, he has no equal." [Burke's Speeches.]

"In the fall of Rome their (*i.e.*, the clergy's) influence upon the barbarians wore down the asperities of conquest, and saved the provincials half the shock of that tremendous Revolution." [Hallam's *State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, vol. ii., p. 150.]

"Religion alone made a bridge, as it were, across the chaos, and has linked the two periods of ancient and modern civilization." [Hallam's *Middle Ages*, vol. iii., p. 291.]

The following Petition was humbly presented to the Holy Father in the beginning of the year 1873 :—

PETITION TO THE MOST HOLY FATHER PIUS IX.

We, laymen of the United Kingdom of England, approach the throne of you, most Holy Father, Supreme Guide of the Christian World, and Father of the Family of Christ on Earth, to implore you to take into consideration the calamities which now afflict nations, and the evils which now, more than ever, oppress individuals (and especially the poor) in this age of vaunted civilization. We are persuaded that these evils are due, in part, to special judgments of God for the crimes of nations and men ; and are, in part, the necessary results of departures from the Laws of God ;—that is to say, they are caused by a disregard of the Law of Justice, and of the Law of Charity.

We, therefore, pray you, Holy Father, to promulgate specifically those laws which should bind nations in their conduct towards each other, in order that the present antagonisms, bloodshed, and anarchy may cease. We pray you also to promulgate laws regarding discipline and the penances which are fitting to be imposed on individuals, as helps in their struggle against the world, the flesh, and the devil, and as expiations for the crimes which they may commit. Moreover, we pray you that you would bring again into full life that judicial power which has been exercised, more or less, for eighteen centuries, by the Holy Father—the Supreme Judge of the actions of nations and of men—and by the Hierarchy of the Church on Earth ; that Judicial Power which was instituted by our Lord himself, which has once rescued the world from Paganism, and which may again raise it from barbarism and bloodshed in its international relations, and from the crimes which deface the private lives of men.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P.

(AND OTHERS.)

JOSEPH DOLLARD, PRINTER, DAME-STREET, DUBLIN.





3 0112 077860259